

**MADISON COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 28, 2008**

I. Call to order

The meeting was called to order by President Ann Schwend at 6:10 p.m.

II. Roll Call

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Ann Schwend, John Lounsbury, Donald Loyd, Dave Maddison, Lane Adamson, Dorothy Davis, Kathy Looney, Eileen Pearce, Ed Ruppel and Pat Bradley,

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Laurie Schmidt.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Jarvis and Marilee Tucker.

STAFF MEMBERS ABSENT: Charity Fechter.

OTHERS PRESENT: David Elias, Frank Rydeen, Joe G. Husar, Ken Brown, Charles Raches, Will Murray, Scott McClintic, Gay Rossow, Marilyn Ross, David Delisi, Carol Delisi, Tom Olenecki, Scott McCormack, Mark Wood, Lauren Waterton, Melissa Tuemmler, Douglas and Valerie McCollum, John Anderson, Joe Schlemmer, Mike McDonald, Gerald Anderson, Kathleen Anderson, Susan Craft, Linda Schaar, Ronald Schaar, Jody West, JoAnn Spaulding, Floyd and Dotty Fredinska, Kim Miller, Marilyn Ross and Lauren Waterton.

III. Minutes of the April 7, 2008 meeting

| |
|--|
| <p>MOTION: To approve the April 7, 2008 meeting minutes with one correction. Motion made by Kathy Looney, seconded by Dorothy Davis. Motion passed unanimously.</p> |
|--|

IV. President's Comments

Ann Schwend went over the agenda for the meeting and pointed out that there would be public comment taken for the pre-applications and minor subdivisions.

V. Opportunity for Public Comment

There were no public comments given.

The Board took a few moments to read materials handed out at the meeting.

VI. Public Hearings

A. Overall Development Plan—Lone Moose Meadows Planned Unit Development, at the Madison/Gallatin line south of MT Hwy 64, (Owner, Thunderwolf Development, LLC by American Land Development, LLC)

Jim Jarvis gave an overview of the project and pointed out the findings in his staff report. He mentioned that another project for this area had come before the Planning Board last May on an informal basis. Staff report and findings from then had revealed concerns relating to challenging building sites, geotech concerns and wildlife impacts. He also pointed out that the current project is not in the Big Sky Water and Sewer District as yet, but has applied to be included. Jim recommended approval of the ODP with conditions set forth in his staff report. Lauren Waterton and Scott McCormack represented the project, thanking Jim for his help in working with them. Tom Olenecki spoke to the Board about wildlife issues.

Site Description:

This is a 535 acre site located within the steep sided valley of the Middle Fork of the West Fork of the Gallatin River. The property straddles the Madison/Gallatin County line at MT 64/Lone Mountain Trail, midway between Meadow Village and Mountain Village in Big Sky. The Overall development Plan is for the 185 acres of the total development lying within Madison County. Access is provided by MT Highway 64 which defines the northern border of the property. The portion of the project in Gallatin County received Master Planned Unit Development approval in 2000. Some development has already occurred on the Gallatin County side of the property.

Proposal:

148 dwelling units made up of 21 single-family units (1-6 acre lots), 9 triplex units (1/2-3/4 acre lots) and a 100-unit skier services/condo/hotel, and low-intensity recreation area and open space.

Public Comment: Two letters were received in the office:

1. Bureau of Mines and Technology-cautioning about some of the geotech limitations of the property and area.
2. Ronald and Jamie Leaf-concern about the change in the use of Low Dog Road would impact the tranquility, beauty and privacy of their home on that road. They were also concerned about light and noise contamination. They also listed cutting down of trees and disturbance of the native ground cover that would affect the river corridor and existing wildlife.

Those who spoke at the meeting:

Charles Raches: (has lived in Lone Moose Meadows for eight years)

- He is supportive of the use of Road A
- Scott McCormack is very good to work with
- Supportive of the ODP

Comments/Questions from the Board and Staff:

Wildlife Connectivity Route

Tom Olenicki- Wildlife connectivity north to south is not a problem. They move mostly from the east into this area. Most wildlife is habituated already. This is the last remaining connectivity route in the Big Sky area. Wildlife in general reacts to sight, sound and smells.

Is the connectivity route primarily used in Summer and Fall? *It is also used in late Spring. This is the last remaining wildlife connectivity route in the Big Sky area.*

There is a concern with Pod Q and water corridor and wetlands. Does wildlife use the corridor? *Yes. Tom Olenicki-The water corridors are the best connectivity for wildlife and this is a concern especially for moose. We think there is a wide enough corridor for them. A lot of this was logged at one time so the wetlands aren't in the best shape.*

Landslide Area Identification

Your materials identify two landslides, but only one is addressed in a previous letter from 2003, why? *Some slide activity occurred from work done on Highway 64 and the soils there collected water and became unstable. MDT is working on this to help alleviate the problem.*

Isn't Area O, in the Thermopolis formation, prone to landslides too? *We haven't seen slides there and are proposing only two homes in that area to cut down on disturbance of the soil.*

What about Area R? *This is the lowest density in the development and the least risky for landslides. At preliminary and final plat stages subdivision specific geotech studies must be done.*

Jim Jarvis told the Board that at the Final Plat stage, all building sites will be noted on the plat and required to receive a site specific geotech analysis prior to any approval.

Flooding Issues

Are Areas Q and R prone to flooding? *These are fairly steep slopes, so I 'm not exactly sure how flooding would occur. Upon the submittal of the subdivision, there would have to be geotechnical reporting on a high level to ensure that the building sites would not be flooded.*

Road Concerns

Jim Jarvis added that when each phase of the project is brought in, that any concerns about roads in that particular phase would be addressed more specifically at that time.

These roads are really curvy; how steep are they? *They have to be below an average grade according to county standards. We have worked very hard to minimize the impacts on the existing environment there; trying to minimize the cutting of trees, and don't want to have more cuts on the side of the hill. What we sell is the beauty of Montana, so we don't want to ruin that. We're trying to figure the best road plan to meet that requirement*

Why is the one road a one way road? *To reduce the width of the road. We were only able to get an approach from MDT where a left turn on to the highway would not be permitted.*

Does the development impact Low Dog Road? Does it rely on Low Dog Road for any access? *No, it does not connect to it.*

Will you work with the Big Sky Resort regarding the use of Low Dog Road for ski traffic? *Yes. Absolutely. We are committed to maintaining the recreational ski access.*

Wetlands

I think you are placing these places in the wetlands to avoid the extreme slopes and I am concerned about the density there in that pod (Q) and concerns about the wildlife corridor in R. My feeling would be to move both Q and R out of the region. If you find you can't develop some of the areas, would you then transfer density to other areas? *We will have to address as we go along. May have to do an amended ODP.*

There are multiple concerns here: wildlife, water quality, wetlands, slopes and geotech hazards. Doing condominium type building here is a concern. *We are proposing a building that would be a large linear home with three housing units in it. We are committed to doing a responsible development from a wildlife and wetlands standpoint.*

Overall Density

Our concern is that this is an Overall Development Plan which puts a cap on the number of units.

What will you do if Big Sky Water and Sewer won't annex you in?

We have been working with them closely and haven't seen any indications that we won't be annexed.

Geotech Concerns

Pod P area has better bedrock conditions than Pod O. Pod P is characterized as the Kootenai formation and considerably more stable than the Thermopolis formation near Pod O. The Kootenai formation is still susceptible to landslides especially near shale layers. The Thermopolis formation extends above and below the highway cut and is very prone to landslides. Foundations must be carefully designed to address these soil conditions.

Recycling

In your land stewardship plan there is a section on recycling, but that you aren't going to be doing any because Big Sky isn't doing any, but we would like to encourage it. *Due to the expense, we will be promoting this to the rest of Big Sky.*

MOTION: To recommend approval of the Lone Moose Meadows Overall Development Plan with conditions as laid out in the Amended Staff Report. Moved by Don Loyd and seconded by Ed Ruppel. Motion carries unanimously.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above discussion and proposed Findings of Fact, the Planning Board recommends approval of the Lone Moose Meadows ODP, subject to the following conditions:

[Standard ODP conditions]

1. Any and all adopted State and County requirements and standards which apply to this proposed ODP must be met unless otherwise waived for cause by the governing body.
2. Once accepted, an ODP remains in effect for ten years. The developer can amend the ODP as part of any future subdivision review application.
3. Future modification of any elements of the ODP cannot be made without County review and approval.

[Subdivision-specific conditions]

Upon submittal of each phase of development, Lone Moose Meadows shall:

1. Provide evidence of annexation into the Big Sky County Water and Sewer District or provisions for a similar level of service.
2. Provide evidence of MDT-approved access road encroachment permits for connection to MT Highway 64.
3. Provide an update on employee and/or affordable housing opportunities within the overall project.
4. Show willingness to jointly participate with other Big Sky area developers in a Madison County led study to address traffic safety issues on US 191 and MT 64.
5. Prior to preliminary plat review, submit a subdivision-specific geotechnical assessment for all proposed road and building site locations.
6. Show on the face of the final plat this statement, "prior to construction a comprehensive geotechnical investigation including a slope stability analysis is required for each residential lot".
7. Provide phase and land use specific evaluations of anticipated impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat as well as evidence of current and proposed steps taken to limit impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat.
8. Provide a phase/site specific proposal to limit or prevent impacts to water quality as well as evidence of recent and current steps taken to protect water quality in the form of a DEQ stormwater management plan.
9. Provide a phase and site-specific wetland evaluation and proposed measures to limit or avoid impacts to wetlands as applicable in the form of a 404 permit application.

[Additional Notes]

1. At any subdivision phase, Lone Moose Meadows may be required to provide all or part of an updated environmental assessment, in accordance with the Madison County Subdivision Regulations, to address impacts that emerge and changing conditions over time.
2. Regarding traffic safety, at some point it may become necessary for Madison County, in response to public safety concerns, to deny subdivision applications in the Big Sky area, including but not limited to Lone Moose Meadows, until traffic safety improvements have been made.
3. Lone Moose Meadows is encouraged to further minimize the potential for human/animal conflicts and maximize the opportunity for wildlife connectivity by more heavily clustering its development, removing development pods from high quality habitat and adding density to locations with low quality habitat.

4. Based on the nature of an ODP, it is understood that the distribution of units and commercial real estate is tentative and will be refined as more information is gathered and each planning area goes through the subdivision review process.
 5. The 2008 ODP is for a maximum cap of 148 dwelling units made up of 21 single-family units (1-6 acre lots), 9 triplex units (1/2-3/4 acre lots) and a 100-unit skier services/condo/hotel, and low-intensity recreation area and open space.
-

VII. Preliminary Plat Review of Williams Creek Minor Subdivision, approximately 1 mile east of Anderson Lane, south of Alder, (Gay Rossow and Scott McClintic, landowners)

Site Description and Proposal:

Jim Jarvis described the proposal as a 162-acre site located four miles southeast of Alder, Montana and 1 mile east of the intersection of the Anderson Lane and Williams Creek Road. The proposal is to divide the property into five single family lots. One lot is to be 82.3 acres in size and the other four will be 20 acres each. He stated that John Anderson of the neighboring Ruby Dell Ranch and the developers have been meeting on several subjects relating to the proposal and have agreed on the covenants. For that reason the covenants were given to the Planning Board this evening as the agreements had been late in being fleshed out. The developer's representative asked if the fire access should be shown on the map and the response was yes, since it is an easement.

Will Murray of Kirk Engineering spoke to the Board and said that there would not be building near the ephemeral streams on the property. The 82.3 acre piece is to be kept by the developer.

Comments/Questions from the Board and Staff:

What is the water supply for fire protection? *It is a 10,000 gallon cistern suggested by the Alder Fire Department.*

Can you put in a small well to assist the cistern? *The cistern will be assisted by the owners' well.*

Is your wildlife friendly fencing the usual kind? *Yes, it's the standard design.*

Why is there a minimum of 2000 square foot home in the covenants? *This was part of the agreement with the former landowner Ellis Boyd.*

Could you talk with him about making that a smaller square footage? *Yes.*

It's more about design criteria, than square footage. We don't want to get into being the "design police".

Is the neighboring 320 acres going to be subdivided too? *That has all fallen apart. The Boyds don't seem to be inclined to subdivide themselves. Do elk stay on the property during hunting season? My legs will tell you "no".*

Ann Schwend held up a Clear Creek Realty Advertisement advertising the proposed subdivision property and said, "it is not appropriate to advertise the property for sale prior to coming through the preliminary plat process".

Public Comment:

John Anderson of Ruby Dell Ranch handed out maps and statements to the Board. He said that "it is not exactly true that this development will have no impact on agriculture". He stated that the Williams Creek Road goes through their calving ground and that it is unfenced. The increased traffic will cause the ranch to have to fence the road. The ranch will have to spend approximately \$18,000 on fencing for the safety of their livestock. He also stated that the elk are coming into the hay meadows at night and wintering in the low hills to the north. They migrate from the south hills to the north, through the proposed subdivision. He stated that his family is opposed to the subdivision due to the impacts of possible additional subdividing along with the current subdivision proposal.

Comments/Questions from the Board and Staff:

The effects on agriculture are negative, not neutral as shown in the Staff Report.

The effects on wildlife are not neutral (second Planning Board member opinion). The Fish and Game personnel did not say the effects were negative, so how can the Planner say so?

The public (potential buyers) should be informed as to the Right to Farm Ordinance.

This project does not help the movement of the wildlife.

The increased number of elk all over the county is having an effect on agriculture. As growth occurs, wildlife gets dispersed and crowded into smaller areas.

Why didn't you put the 20-acre parcels together? This is a strange configuration. *It was a lay of the land issue. We put in the covenants that the owners agree not to further divide the property for at least five years.*

MOTION: To recommend preliminary plat approval to Williams Creek Minor Subdivision with conditions set forth in the Staff Report. Moved by John Lounsbury and seconded by Kathy Looney.

AMENDMENT TO THE MAIN MOTION: To include language in the "additional notes" of the Staff Report that recognizing that this project has

a negative impact on agriculture, the Planning Board recommends that Lot 3 not be further subdivided. Moved by Dave Maddison, seconded by Lane Adamson. Motion carried unanimously.

VOTE ON THE MAIN MOTION: Motion carried unanimously.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION

Based on the staff analysis and proposed Findings of Fact, the Planning Board recommends approval of the Williams Creek Minor Subdivision Preliminary Plat subject to the conditions listed below.

[Standard subdivision conditions]

1. Any and all adopted State and County requirements and standards which apply to this proposed subdivision must be met unless otherwise waived for cause by the governing body.
2. A notarized declaration of "Right to Farm" and "Emergency Services Information" (Appendix R of 2006 Madison County Subdivision Regulations) must be filed with the final plat.
3. The final plat must be accompanied by a certification by a licensed title abstractor showing the owners of record, the names of any lienholders or claimants of record against the land, and the written consent to the subdivision from any lienholders or claimants of record against the land.
4. All subdivision road and utility easements (or rights-of-way) shall be clearly shown and labeled on the final plat.
5. Future modification of any elements shown on the plat may not be made without County review and approval.

[Specific subdivision conditions]

6. The final plat shall include a statement whereby lot owners waive their right to protest any rural improvement district (RID) designated by Madison County to protect public health and safety on public roads leading to the subdivision.
7. Prior to final plat approval, proposed road names and temporary addresses shall be submitted to and approved by Madison County Planning.
8. Prior to final plat approval, temporary physical addresses must be assigned to each lot in accordance with Madison County's rural addressing and Emergency 911 system.

9. Upon completion of road improvements and prior to building construction, a permanent address shall be assigned to each building site. Individual address signs shall be erected at the driveway entrances.
10. The developer agrees to contribute toward the costs to improve Williams Creek Road as described in the January 14, 2008 letter from Commissioner Dave Schulz.
11. Prior to final plat approval, the developer agrees to ensure that the subdivision's primary access road (Makers Way and private drive), and secondary emergency access routes, i.e. east side jeep trail and Lot 5 easement are improved to county road standards.
12. Prior to final plat approval, the developer agrees to install a 10,000 gallon cistern and dry hydrant and appropriate road signage.
13. In the event that the road, utilities or other required improvements are not completed prior to final plat submission, an Improvements Agreement and irrevocable Letter of Credit or equivalent guarantee shall be filed with the Board of County Commissioners prior to final plat approval. The amount of the letter of credit shall be 125% of the engineer's estimated cost for the improvements. Any letter of credit or other guarantee must cover the time period needed to complete project improvements.

Staff Note: Covenants should be expanded to:

1. Notify property owners of potential geotechnical hazards of the area, i.e. Earthquake Hazard Number 10 and Earthquake Hazard Susceptibility Rating 8.
2. Specify fire fill facilities as an additional maintenance responsibility of the property owners.

Additional Staff Note:

1. Recognizing that this development has a negative impact on agriculture, the Planning Board recommends that Lot 3 not be further subdivided.

The Board took a five minute break.

VIII. PRE-APPLICATIONS

ELIAS MILL GULCH MINOR SUBDIVISION, south side of Mill Gulch Road, approximately 4.2 miles east of Laurin, (David Elias, landowner)

Jim Jarvis introduced the minor subdivision as a 4-lot residential minor subdivision.

Site Description and Proposal:

This proposal consists of 112.04 acres to be divided into four residential lots and is described as Tract 3 of COS 7/1986, in the SW1/4, Section 36, T5S, R4W, P.M.M. It is located approximately 4.2 miles east of Laurin, Montana. The proposal is to divide the acreage into four residential lots ranging from 22.57 acres to 35.42 acres.

David Elias, landowner and developer told the Board that there is no surface water on the land, so there are no water rights issues. He intends to leave the boundaries open, and not fence the perimeters of the property. It is range to elk, deer and antelope. There would be fencing permitted around the 2 acre homesites. At this time he does not have covenants, but will consider the recommendations of the Board in that regard. His chief concern is groundwater as there is not a large amount of groundwater on the property. He will work with Commissioner Dave Schulz as to the road improvements plan.

Comments/Questions from the Board and Staff:

On the vicinity map will Tracts 2B and 1B be developed? Yes.
Do these lots pass the length as to width requirement? Yes.
Others in the area have had difficulty finding water or getting much flow out of their wells. *We have worked to find appropriate building sites.*
You should think about providing building envelopes.
Try to avoid ridge top development.

Public Comment:

Ken Brown appeared before the Board with the following concerns:

- Everything above this property is cut into 160-acre parcels, so we will probably see more development in this area.
- The draw where this land is located is a major hiding place for elk, mule deer, whitetail deer and antelope. It's a shame to have all of these areas built upon.
- There's really no place but a knoll to build a home there.

Rancho Vista Verde Major Subdivision, located off of Point of Rocks Road three miles southeast of Whitehall, (Temple, LLC (David and Valerie McCollum), landowner; First Shot Enterprises, representative.

Jim Jarvis gave an overview of the proposal and stated that the Planning Office had received many letters and phone calls about the project, the majority of

which were negative to the project. He handed out a summary of the correspondence received.

Melissa Tuemmler of First Shot Enterprises said that there seems to be increased public interest in buying smaller parcels. She said that she has found that a lot of “baby boomers” don’t want to take care of larger tracts. She said that she and the owners want to work with the representatives of the Parrot Ditch, but that there is a conflict between their requests of those of Fish, Wildlife and Parks in relation to fencing the ditch. FWP does not prefer fencing because it could impede wildlife movement and use of the water. She stated that agricultural use of the land is no longer a viable option.

Comments/Questions from the Board and Staff:

Two horses could be kept on each individual tract? *We are working with the County Extension office to create an agriculture management plan.*

It would be a plus to forget horses.

Even feeding horses on two acres, they hammer it (the land).

Good luck keeping your trees going. It’s difficult to grow trees on those benches.

Are the owners going to take care of the Homeowners’ Association before there is 75% of the project sold? *Yes.*

How will you deal with the trash generated by this project? *The Cardwell dumpster is far away. We will take a look at that.*

A lot of the letters we have received are concerned with project being in Madison County while using Jefferson County services.

Has consideration been made to a more cluster-type development with more open space? *That usually means community water and sewer and that is pretty expensive.*

Could you centralize an equestrian center rather than having horses on the small lots? *We are open to making adjustments.*

Many of the letters objected to the 2-acre parcels, but favored larger. What about 5-15-acre parcels? *There’s room to expand the buffer between adjacent landowners and the project, but don’t see how this changes anything.*

Overall density is a concern. I would prefer to see this in an ODP form, done in stages. You should try to make this more compatible with the area.

You are building a community (with this project). *We don’t think there is a magical number of lots. I’m in favor of zoning an area so that everyone knows what the ground rules are and not done on a case by case basis. Agricultural expenses are increasing and there isn’t that much demand for larger parcels.*

Phasing might be a good way of approaching this to help with costs etc.

Might help alleviate fears of so many lots at once.

Didn’t you say at the site tour that you were considering an ODP?

Wouldn’t you want to see what the overall design is?

You could do shared septic and drainfields and cluster. Why not consider the clustered approach? *Would hate to see all of the clustering.*

This proposal does not fit the character of the area.
With that many people it would be nice to have more park land.
We have reduced the square footage.
Please consider suggesting the use of reclaimed wood.
The Sheriff states that it would take 60 minutes to respond from the Sheriff's Office.

Public Comment:

President Ann Schwend told those in the audience that the best way to have your voice heard is to supply the Planning Office with written comment.

Kathleen Anderson – Is there room for the (potential) kids in this subdivision in the Whitehall Schools?

Steve Wagner – My concern is with the density of this and troubled about the plan with the equestrian trail and the number (of people) using it. Horses on two acres is not good. Clustering is a good idea with more open space. Dust control is a big issue. The road doesn't get enough attention. Dust control on the interior roads is a concern as well as weed control.

Joe Schlemmer – (Representing the Parrot Ditch) We differ from Fish, Wildlife and Parks as to fencing or not fencing the canal. This is solvable. This subdivision has been generous to give us a 200' easement on the ditch. We want to make sure that the fence idea is adequately dealt with.

Ann Schwend – How much water goes through there? 40 cfs usually. Defining the easement is very important.

Pat Bradley – What is the liability if a child drowns? Don't know.

Ann Schwend – One of the challenges for the Board is that we don't have zoning and we have to look at each subdivision on a case by case basis.

Jo Ann Spaulding – We have the forty acres next door. This is good land. Whitehall's population is 1156 and this development has the potential of half of that.

Ron Schaar – (real estate appraiser) I was the first person to build in Jefferson River Ranches. We have seven houses (there) mostly owned by out of state (owners). They don't take care of their properties. These properties (Rancho Vista Verde) will get speculated to out of state buyers. Bigger parcels are not unpopular, but they are just too expensive. This subdivision as planned will not work. There are wells out there that are 300' deep with 8 gallons per minute. Dust issue is a health and safety issue. It is not feasible the way it is planned.

Pat Bradley – Do we consider the petition that is against the subdivision?

Don Loyd – We should follow our procedures in the subdivision regulations.

IX. OLD BUSINESS

Streamside Protection Regulations, status report

Jim Jarvis reported that he compiled and submitted all of the comments pertaining to the project and has 50 pages double sided consisting of letters etc. He added that there are three main areas of agreement:

Nonconformance (grandfathering):

- a. Existing building should be allowed to rebuild in the same place, if destroyed or razed.
- b. Re-building of structures destroyed by flood should be treated differently, i.e. variance.
- c. Some level of expansion of existing buildings should be allowed.

Jim informed the group that the next meeting of the Steering Committee will be at 6:30 in the basement of First Madison Valley Bank on May 6.

Bradley Creek Subdivision Site Tour, notes

Ann said that **Gregor** Schwend was not mentioned as being present on the tour.

Other – None

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Planning Board Member Reports

Dave Maddison – A 15' easement on either side of an irrigation ditch is not adequate for equipment and the material from the ditch. We should say it should be at least 30'.

John Lounsbury – Shouldn't that be a State regulation?

Dave Maddison - We also need to determine what a cluster development is.

Pat Bradley – At the workshop in Sheridan the most interesting part of the discussion was the part about trans-border problems among counties. Also, JDL Construction was featured in the Standard last Saturday. Lane was on TV on a program about wolves.

Kathy Looney – The New West Conference was very good. There were articles shown about subdivisions that are going

belly up. The word that came up again and again was “outcome”. We need to be mindful of the outcome.

B. Geology Field Trip

Ed Ruppel is willing to take the board anywhere in the county, and suggested a tour to the Upper Ruby area.

| |
|---|
| MOTION: To direct the Planning Office staff to come up with a format for the tour. Moved by Don Loyd and seconded by John Lounsbury. Motion passed unanimously |
|---|

**C. Planning Office Report
None**

XI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Ann Schwend, President

Marilee Tucker, Secretary